Back to Bible Version Reports

Back to the Way of Life Home Page

Way of Life Literature Online Catalog

EXAMINING "THE KING JAMES ONLY CONTROVERSY"

PART 1 OF 4

[Distributed by Way of Life Literatureâs Fundamental Baptist Information Service. Copyright 1998. These articles cannot be stored on BBS or Internet sites and cannot be sold or placed by themselves or with other material in any electronic format for sale, but may be distributed for free by e-mail or by print. They must be left intact and nothing removed or changed, including these informational headers. This is a listing for Fundamental Baptists and other fundamentalist, Bible-believing Christians. Our goal is not devotional but is TO PROVIDE INFORMATION TO ASSIST PREACHERS IN THE PROTECTION OF THE CHURCHES IN THIS APOSTATE HOUR. If you desire to receive this type of material on a regular basis, e-mail us, give us your name, address, and the name of the church you are a member of, and request to be placed on the list. Please note that this is not a free service. We take up a quarterly offering to fund this ministry, and each subscriber is expected to participate. To unsubscribe or to submit a change of address, send your name and the request to fbns@wayoflife.org. This is not an automated list. Changes in the database often require two to four days to activate. Some of these articles are from O Timothy magazine. David W. Cloud, Editor. O Timothy is a monthly magazine in its 17th year of publication. Subscription is $20/yr. Way of Life publishes many helpful books. The catalog is located at the web site -- http://www.wayoflife.org.]

Updated March 1, 2000 (first published March 5, 1998) (David W. Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061, fbns@wayoflife.org) -

Many friends have asked me to review the popular book *The*

King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Translations? by James White (1963-) (Minneapolis: Bethany House Publishers, 1995, 286 p.). White was educated at Southern Baptist Grand Canyon University and at Fuller Theological Seminary, both hotbeds of New Evangelical (and worse) compromise. It does not surprise me to see him parroting the tired theories of the undependable textual critics. What does surprise me is how widely White's book has been accepted in Fundamental Baptist circles.

INTRODUCTION

My first thought, as I looked through this book, was that this is a strange piece of writing. The world of Bible translation is becoming increasingly, bewilderingly perverse, yet James White aims his gun not at the Bible corrupters but at men who are attempting to defend God's Word against the onslaught of end-times apostasy. Almost each passing year brings to light an English Bible version more corrupt than its predecessor. This is on the commercial side of Bible translations, yet the corruption is also evident in the field of professional missionary translation. The United Bible Societies, working hand in hand with the Roman Catholic Church, have almost completely given up on "formal equivalency" translation and have dedicated their vast resources to the production of paraphrase-type Bibles created with the presumptuous dynamic equivalency method of translation. The same is true for Wycliffe Bible Translators. White sounds no warning of these matters, though. His readers are given the impression that the onslaught of modernism in the field of Bible texts and translations is a matter of minor consequence

compared to the great "error" of believing God has preserved His Word in the Received Text and in Received Text translations which have gone to the ends of the earth during the past five centuries of great missionary endeavor. Consider the following amazing statement in the foreword to White's book, written by Mike Baird, a professor at the Southern Baptist-aligned Grand Canyon University:

> "In this age of uncertainty, the last thing we need is the suspicion that the Word of God is somehow faulty and misleading. Yet many, even within Christendom, have set about to undermine the authority of Scripture. This happens in places of higher criticism, but it also happens in places where we are least suspecting. James White, in *The King James Only Controversy*, deals with this sense of uncertainty in God's Word promoted by those who defend the KJV as the only reliable Bible" (p. i).

I shake my head at the strangeness of this statement. How does the defense of a pure Scripture text create uncertainty in God's Word? How can the defense of a pure Bible be compared with the heresy of higher criticism? There is a popular book which claims, tongue-in-cheek, that women live on Venus and men live on Mars, referring to the vast difference in the way men and women think and act. A similar gulf exists between those who defend the King James Bible and those who defend the modern versions. It is very difficult for one to understand the other! The modern version defender allows a man to say the Scriptures were verbally inspired and infallible when they were first written, but he goes ballistic when he hears a man say that he has a verbally inspired Bible in his hands today. He charges such a man with heresy. He labels him a troublemaker, and an ignoramus, to boot.

I realize that the defense of the King James Bible and the Received Text creates doubt in the modern versions, but at the same time it creates complete faith in the preserved Scriptures. On the other hand, the modern version position creates doubt in EVERY Bible! According to the modern version position, there is no text or translation that can be trusted entirely. At the very least dozens of verses and thousands of words are in question, so the adherent is loosed from the rock of biblical certainty and is left to drift upon the shifting sands of modern textual scholarship.

Further, I did not read in White's book long before I realized that it is misnamed. It should be titled *The Ruckman-Riplinger Controversy*, because White paints the entire movement in defense of the King James Bible with the brush of these two individuals.

White's book appears, at first glance, to be an unemotional, objective, scholarly approach to the topic of Bible texts and versions. In reality, it is a slander upon defenders of the King James Bible and the Received Text underlying the KJV and other great Reformation Bibles. He implies throughout that every KJV defender is either a raving lunatic or an ignorant extremist. He ignores or passes over slightly, even flippantly, the great issues of the KJV defense, focusing, instead, upon indefensible representations.

The King James Only Controversy is straw man, smokescreen apologetics at its best. This is serious, because many men who read White's book will become severely biased against "King James Onlyism" and, as a consequence, will never make the

effort to read for themselves the many important materials written in defense of the Received Text and the KJV. It reminds us of a statement made by Dr. Alfred Martin, former vice president of Moody Bible Institute, in his doctoral thesis at Dallas Theological Seminary in 1951:

> **"In spite of the notable work of Burgon, Hoskier, and others who supported them, the opponents of the Westcott-Hort theory have never had the hearing which they deserve. How many present-day students of the Greek New Testament ever heard of the two men just mentioned, and how many ever saw a copy of *The Revision Revised* or *Codex B and Its Allies*, to say nothing of actually reading these works? ... THE PRESENT GENERATION OF BIBLE STUDENTS, HAVING BEEN REARED ON WESTCOTT AND HORT, HAVE FOR THE MOST PART ACCEPTED THE THEORY WITHOUT INDEPENDENT OR CRITICAL EXAMINATION**. To the average student of the Greek New Testament today it is unthinkable to question the theory at least in its basic premises. Even to imply that one believes the Textus Receptus to be nearer the original text than the Westcott-Hort text is, lays one open to the suspicion of gross ignorance or unmitigated bigotry. That is why this controversy needs to be aired again among Bible-believing Christians**. There is little hope of convincing those who are unbelieving textual critics, but IF BELIEVING BIBLE STUDENTS HAD THE EVIDENCE OF BOTH SIDES PUT BEFORE THEM, INSTEAD OF ONE SIDE ONLY, THERE WOULD NOT BE SO MUCH BLIND FOLLOWING OF WESTCOTT AND HORT"** (Alfred Martin, *A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory*, Th.D. Thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, May 1951, pp. 4,46,47).

This was the condition that Alfred Martin witnessed in Christian education in the late 1940s and early 1950s. It is much worse

today. The reason why most students at colleges and seminaries are not presented with both sides of the Bible text-translation issue is because of men like James White, who do everything in their power to make the defenders of the Received Text and the King James Bible look like fools. I believe these men have a lot to answer for before God.

Let me say at the outset that I am convinced that James White's book on Bible versions is a dangerous book. This is because it is dead wrong and it is leading men and women away from the preserved Word of God, yet it is very popular. It is hastening a process that is destroying absolute truth in churches.

A CRITIQUE OF THE KING JAMES ONLY CONTROVERSY

WHITE'S APPROACH TO THE TOPIC OF TEXTS AND VERSIONS IS MAN-CENTERED, RATHER THAN GOD-CENTERED.

James White focuses almost exclusively upon men—Erasmus, the KJV translators, Calvin, Beza, King James Bible defenders—and upon their frailties. I keep asking myself, where does this author think God was during the past 500 years? His approach is rationalistic as opposed to simple faith based on God's promises. He approaches the history of the text with his eyes upon man and human scholarship. Though he is an "evangelical" (the term is in quotations because it is almost meaningless today, a fact which has been witnessed in recent years by evangelical leaders

themselves, in books such as *The Great Evangelical Disaster* by Francis Schaeffer and *No Place for Truth: or Whatever Happened to Evangelical Theology?* by David F. Wells), his approach to the Biblical text mirrors that of theological modernists and neo-orthodox ecumenists such as Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger, who are repeatedly exalted as authorities. This is the root error of those who defend the modern critical texts and versions. They do not approach this issue by faith; they approach it by human intellect and scholarship. The Bible says that "without faith it is impossible to please him" (Heb. 11:6). No one can recognize the inspired, preserved Word of God apart from faith.

WHITE IGNORES GOD'S PROMISE OF BIBLICAL PRESERVATION EXCEPT TO MENTION IT IN PASSING.

Note the following statement:

> "KJV Only advocates are quick to assert that those who do not join them in making the KJV the final authority in all things do not believe in the 'preservation of the Scriptures.' Almost all KJV Only books will contain a section on how God has promised to preserve His words, and they will, of course, assume that these 'words' are found in the KJV" (White, p. 47).

As he does throughout the book, White quickly paints this issue with the brush of extremism. In telling his readers how King James Bible defenders allegedly define preservation, he says they believe the Bible was "re-inspired" in 1611. This might be what a few believe, but I know hundreds of King James Bible

defenders, including many of those who are writing on this subject, and it is certainly not what most believe. In fact, I don't know anyone who believes the Bible was re-inspired in 1611. White does not quote from any one to demonstrate his point. He merely claims that some believe this. To my knowledge (and, as far as I know, I am the only man who has written an extensive history of King James Bible defense) the common view among King James Bible defenders is that God preserved the pure Greek and Hebrew text and delivered it to the Reformation editors; it was subsequently translated into many major languages and carried to the ends of the earth during the great missionary movement of the last five centuries. Most King James Bible defenders, to my knowledge, do not confuse inspiration with preservation. They understand that inspiration refers to the original giving of the Scriptures to the prophets and apostles of old, and that this inspired Scripture has been preserved for us. The King James Bible was not a re-inspiration of God's Word; it was an accurate formal equivalency translation thereof which gave weight to every word in the original language text (unlike a dynamic equivalency such as the New International Version, which makes no attempt to translate all of the Greek and Hebrew words). The authority of the Greek and Hebrew text is carried over into English or into German or French, etc., insofar as the translation is accurate. I could site hundreds of men who believe the view of preservation that I am describing and who would absolutely reject any idea that the Bible was re-inspired in 1611. Consider, for example, the statement of The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies (also known as the Which Bible? Society), which was founded as an extension of Dr. David Otis Fuller's desire to address the version issue and textual debate on a broader scale:

The Institute for Biblical Textual Studies is committed to:

* the immediate, verbal, plenary inspiration of the original writings of Scripture and that they are therefore inerrant and infallible. This inspiration is unique, applicable both to the process of giving the original writings and the writings themselves which are that product;

* the verbal preservation of the Greek Received Text as published by the Trinitarian Bible Society;

* the verbal preservation of the Traditional Masoretic Hebrew Text of Daniel Bomberg, as edited by Jacob ben Chayim;

* the position that translation is not an inherent boundary to verbal preservation. The breath of God, product, not process, conveyed by translation from the immediately inspired language copies of Scripture into any providentially prepared receptor language will impart to that translation infallible authority and doctrinal inerrancy inherent in the original language copies. Such a translation by the internal witness of the Holy Spirit, both with and through that translation, will evidence to the believer its own self-attestation and self-authentication whereby God asserts himself as the supreme Authority to that culture. For the English speaking world this revelation of God's authority is preserved in the Authorized Version.

The late David Otis Fuller, editor of three very influential books in defense of the King James Bible, *Which Bible?*, *True or False?*, and *Counterfeit or Genuine?*, has been widely maligned by those who promote the modern versions. We see, though, that the organization that carries on his work does not confuse inspiration with preservation. The previous statement was written by Peter Van Kleeck, who is the pastor of Wealthy Park Baptist Church,

the church pastored by D.O. Fuller for 40 years. Pastor Van Kleeck was Associate Director of the Institute for Biblical Textual Studies from 1990-94. Since then, his father, William Van Kleeck, has assumed this position.

King James Bible defenders argue that it is impossible to believe in biblical preservation and to accept the tenets of modern textual criticism. The latter claims that the purest text of Scripture was misplaced or unused for centuries and did not begin to be recovered until the end of the 19th century. Textual critics tell us that the Received Text, which was without question the traditional text of the vast majority of Bible-believing Christians from 1500 to 1900, is an impure text that contains thousands of latter additions. They tell us that the pure text of the New Testament is actually the shortened Westcott-Hort type text represented today in the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament. The problem is that this text was rejected for hundreds of years until textual critics such as Tischendorf exalted it in the late 1800s, while the Received Text was greatly honored by God. If the Received Text is indeed the impure text, the promise of God has failed. God preserves His Word in its use among His people, not in its misuse and neglect.

Consider a statement that illustrates the way the Received Text-King James Bible defender looks at Bible preservation. This statement was made in 1970 by Donald Brake in a Master of Theology thesis entitled "The Doctrine of the Preservation of Scriptures" presented to the faculty of the Department of Systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary:

> "The issue ultimately is: Has God preserved throughout history a

> continuous, uninterrupted text for the Church or has He merely preserved for one thousand years a corrupted text and then revealed His true text when a German critic at the convent of St. Catherine picked out of a wastebasket one single manuscript?" (Donald Brake, reprinted from *Counterfeit or Genuine?* Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975, p. 179).

We would remind James White that this statement was not made by a fundamental Baptist.

Let me give another example. The following statement was made by John Burgon in the late 19th century:

> "I am utterly disinclined to believe--so grossly improbable does it seem--that at the end of eighteen hundred years 995 copies out of every thousand, suppose, will prove untrustworthy; and that the one, two, three, four, or five which remain, whose contents were till yesterday as good as unknown, will be found to have retained the secret of what the Holy Spirit originally inspired" (Burgon, *The Traditional Text*, p. 12).

If the critical textual editors of the nineteenth century had believed God and His promise of preservation, they would have understood that the pure Word of God was not lost! That's the major point of contention in this entire matter, as I see it. The Word of God was preserved; it was not lost. It was not unused or discarded. My confidence is not in Erasmus or in King James I or in John Burgon or in David Otis Fuller. My confidence is in a God who has promised to preserve His Word. *And if the Bible which went to the ends of the earth during the greatest era of missionary activity in church history since the apostolic era was not the preserved Word of God, there is no such thing as the preserved Word of God, and this entire matter is merely an*

exercise in vanity.

White claims there is another way to look at preservation than to see the God-honored Received Text and the English Authorized Version and other accurate translations thereof as the preserved Word of God. It appears that he is saying that this other way of understanding preservation is to claim that the Bible is "preserved" only vaguely within the bewildering diversity of texts and versions. In a practical sense, though, such a view has almost no meaning for the average Christian. It leaves him dependent upon the "scholars" to tell him what is and is not the preserved Word of God, and the more he examines their teaching, the more he understands that a very large percentage of them do not know what they are talking about!

WHITE LUMPS ALL KING JAMES BIBLE DEFENDERS INTO THE RUCKMAN CAMP.

In the beginning of his book, White divides "KJV Only" into five categories: Those who like the KJV best, those who support the KJV textually, those who are Received Text only, those who believe the KJV is inspired and inerrant, those who believe the KJV is advanced or new revelation. In the body of the book, though, White almost exclusively applies his pet term, "KJV Only," to a Ruckman-type position. In the chapter entitled "The King James Only Camp," White claims that the scholars of the past (such as John Burgon and H.C. Hoskier) who defended the textual tradition underlying the KJV, cannot be included in the "KJV Only" camp. Thus he contradicts his own definition given in chapter one, by refusing to label men as "KJV Only" who are

defenders of the textual tradition underlying the KJV.

White entitles the large section on Ruckman "Spearheading the KJV Only Movement." We see, then, that his objective is to paint every KJV defender with a broad brush—the brush of Ruckmanism. I have seen this among a wide range of men who love to denounce "King James Onlyism." They tend to ignore or lightly pass over the great issues of the Bible version debate and focus instead on human personalities, particularly on Peter Ruckman. In his chapter on "The King James Only Camp," White gives only three examples of "KJV Only" defenders: Edward F. Hills, Gail Riplinger, and Peter Ruckman. He dedicates three brief pages to an incredibly shallow consideration of Hills and then proceeds to dedicate 32 pages to Riplinger and Ruckman. You can see the man's emphasis. Before quoting one of Riplinger's indefensible remarks, for example, White says that her statement "is extremely important for anyone wishing to understand the thinking of KJV Onlyism" (White, *The King James Only Controversy*, p. 108). Thus, you see his attempt to paint the defense of the King James Bible with the broad brush of extremism. He wants his readers to think that the entire defense of the King James Bible is nothing but a mass of conspiratorial theories, of conjecturing, of indefensible statements, of shallow scholarship in the extreme. In reality, Gail Riplinger's statement on page 108 of White's book is important only for someone wishing to understand Gail Riplinger. It is not important if one desires to understand a sound defense of the King James Bible.

White's inclusion of Riplinger as one of the KEY examples of King James Bible defense is even more duplicitous than his use

of Peter Ruckman. At least Dr. Ruckman is a biblical scholar, preacher, and teacher, and has been writing about the King James Bible for many decades. Riplinger's public entrance into this debate did not occur until 1993, only two years before White wrote his book. In reality, to use either of these people as the chief examples of the defense of the King James Bible is to set up a straw man. In my book *For Love of the Bible: The History of the Battle for the Received Text and the King James Bible from 1800 to Present*, I list many examples of men who stood in defense of the Received Text and the King James Bible before Gail Riplinger was born and before Peter Ruckman ever thought of applying his acrid pen to this topic.

Uninformed readers of White's book would naturally assume that all or most "KJV Onlyites" believe the things White is refuting, but this is not the case. I believe it is unreasonable and slanderous to lump all into the same category, but this is what almost every modern version proponent does. The definition of "King James Only" is crucial. As I wrote recently to a friend, as to whether or not I am "KJV-only" depends, obviously, on how the term is defined. I am "KJV only" if that means I believe the KJV is the only completely authoritative English translation of the preserved text of Greek and Hebrew Scripture. I am not "KJV only" if that means the KJV is advanced revelation or is itself given by inspiration or that the English language has replaced the Greek and Hebrew or that the KJV itself has become the standard for all translations or that the KJV is the only Bible through which men can be born again or if it means that every man who disagrees with me is a member of a cult, etc.

WHITE IGNORES THE FACT THAT TENS OF THOUSANDS OF KING JAMES BIBLE DEFENDERS REJECT PETER RUCKMAN AND HIS STRANGE IDEAS AND HIS CARNAL DEMEANOR.

White ignores the fact that many King James Bible defenders have exposed Ruckmanism as an error. The Fundamental Evangelistic Association (FEA) of Los Osos, California, is an example. The FEA, publisher of the respected *Foundation* magazine, has stood in defense of the King James Bible for much of this century and has published materials on the topic of Bible versions that have encouraged thousands of Christians to trust the old English Bible. At the same time, the FEA stands against Ruckmanism. In January 1986, the late M.H. Reynolds, head of the FEA, wrote a paper entitled "Are the Teachings of Dr. Peter S. Ruckman True to the Scriptures?" He gave me a copy of the paper that same year, when I preached at an FEA Bible conference. In the introduction, Dr. Reynolds said: "There may be some who will claim that the information presented in this article is an attack upon one of God's leaders in the Bible version battle; but I cannot remain silent about the false teachings of Dr. Ruckman, especially when so many of his followers appear willing to do so." Dr. Reynolds wrote this paper to help a church that was being infiltrated with Ruckmanism and was on the verge of a carnal split.

The Maranatha Baptist Church of Elkton, Maryland, is also widely known for its unequivocal stand for the King James Bible. Allen Dickerson has been the pastor for more than 40 years. He publishes the *Maranatha Baptist Watchman,* and the church

operates the Maryland Baptist Bible College (P.O. Box 246, 4131 Old Neck Elk Road, Elkton, MD 21922. 410-398-3764). The winter 1994 issue of the college's paper, the *Swordsman*, contained a "Position Paper of Maryland Baptist Bible College on Various Teachings of Dr. Peter Ruckman" by John Cereghin, a teacher at MBBC. The paper notes seven areas in which they disagree with Ruckman: 1. That the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts can be corrected with the English of the Authorized Version. 2. Dr. Ruckman teaches there are errors in the Greek text from which our AV-1611 is translated. 3. Dr. Ruckman believes there are mistakes in the AV-1611 despite his claims to the contrary. 4. Dr. Ruckman claims Satan is a Fundamentalist. 5. Dr. Ruckman claims 'The chief purpose of all higher education (Christian or otherwise) is to get rid of absolute authority (of the Bible).' 6. Dr. Ruckman is guilty of date setting for the Second Advent. 7. Despite claims to the contrary, Dr. Ruckman displays an anti-Christian attitude toward those who do not agree with some of his interpretations on certain Scriptures. The position paper concludes: "Maryland Baptist Bible College, therefore, should not be identified with these teachings of Dr. Peter Ruckman and does not wish to be identified with the same."

Evangelist Paul Freeman also illustrates the many King James Bible defenders who reject Ruckmanism. He has published an excellent book entitled *Doctrinal Changes in the Modern Versions* and he defends the King James Bible without hesitation, but in a letter to me dated December 8, 1994, he wrote: "You are exactly right about Ruckman. He is a false teacher and a disgrace to the fundamental cause. I have seen graduates of the Bible Truth Institute in Sunbury, Penn., ruined by him. (I taught there for two

and a half years.) His teaching on Divorce and Remarriage has put unqualified men in the ministry."

Dr. Donald Waite is a staunch defender of the King James Bible. His book *Defending the King James Bible* is a classic that is widely used among KJV lovers. He believes the KJV is "God's Word kept intact," that it is trustworthy, and that it contains no errors. In *Defending the King James Bible*, Dr. Waite documents what he believes is the four-fold superiority of the KJV: It is superior in its texts, its translators, its techniques, and its theology. Waite has been writing on this subject since the founding of the Bible for Today ministry in 1971. He helped found the Dean Burgon Society in 1978 and has been its president ever since. This society exists to defend the Received Text and the KJV. Its motto is "In defense of traditional Bible text." This refers to the traditional Massoretic Hebrew Old Testament Text that underlies the King James Bible, the traditional Greek New Testament Received Text, and the King James Bible itself, which is the traditional English Bible. Dr. Waite's Bible for Today ministry offers the largest collection of material defending the King James Bible available today, including many reprints of rare 19th-century classics such as Burgon's *Revision Revised* and Hoskier's *Codex B and Its Allies*. As of 1992, the Bible for Today carried over 900 titles on textual issues. In spite of his unhesitating stand for the King James Bible, Dr. Waite has been labeled a heretic by Peter Ruckman because Waite rejects Ruckman's views that the English is advanced revelation and because Dr. Waite refuses to apply the term "inspiration" to the translation of the Bible, believing, instead, that "God Himself did not 'breathe out' English, or German, or French, or Spanish, or

Latin, or Italian. He did 'breathe out' Hebrew/Aramaic, and Greek" (Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, p. 246). In spite of Dr. Waite's firm stand against a Ruckman position that confuses inspiration and preservation and exalts English above the Hebrew/Greek text, James White places Waite directly into the Ruckman camp. This is how extremely biased his book is.

The *Biblical Fundamentalist* is a bi-monthly paper published in Australia. The founding editor, the late Sidney W. Hunter, stood for the Received Text and the King James Bible, yet the June 1, 1993, issue of the *Biblical Fundamentalist* contained an article entitled "Ruckmanism--Its Attack on the KJV." In this article Hunter stated:

> "In his book *The Monarch of Books* (page 9), Ruckman states that 'The King James text is the last and final statement that God has given to the world, and He has given it in the universal language of the 20th century. … The truth is that God slammed the door of revelation shut in 389 BC and slammed it shut again in 1611.' Notice the implications of this absurd statement. Ruckman is saying that just as God closed the Old Testament with the Book of Malachi 389 years before Christ, He has now closed the Bible in the year 1611 with the KJV. What about people who speak languages other than English? Ruckman's position indicates that foreign translations must be made from the English KJV, ignoring the Hebrew and Greek altogether. … Ruckman's fascination with advanced revelation no doubt played a part in his setting the date for the rapture, in his book *Zero Hour Approaches*, to take place the 14th of May, 1989. It is not hard to get sucked into Ruckmanism. A Bible reader sees problems with the modern translations. He then understands that the Westcott and Hort Greek text used in modern translations is not as reliable as the Received Text used in the KJV. He begins reading Ruckman's

> literature or listening to his tapes and rightly understands that the KJV translation is superior to other translations. Ruckman then introduces him to the teaching that the KJV is an up-date on the original Hebrew and Greek and contains advanced revelation. Having been cunningly led this far, the reader accepts Ruckman's error. At first he plans to 'eat the meat and spit out the bones,' but soon he becomes a Ruckmanite."

I also am a King James Bible defender who has warned about Ruckmanism. I have written a booklet entitled *What about Ruckman?* that has been widely distributed and well received among a wide range of King James Bible defenders (and hated by others!). It was first printed in 1994 and the latest edition contains 44 pages of information. It is also at our web site — http://www.wayoflife.org/.

During the early years of our missionary work in South Asia (beginning in January 1979), I diligently researched the Bible text-translation issue. I had studied Greek with a UBS 3rd edition Greek New Testament in Bible school and had been taught that the text debate was a non-issue. My Greek teacher, who was trained at Dallas Theological Seminary, taught us that the KJV and the NASV and the NIV and the Received Greek New Testament and the UBS Greek New Testament were all basically God's Word. It was up to us to pick and choose. By the time I graduated from school I was somewhat prejudiced against a "KJV only" position and was on the verge of questioning whether or not the disputed textual passages were the preserved Word of God. When we began to examine the Bible translations in South Asian languages, I realized I had to make a decision on this crucial issue. The Bible, of course, is foundational to everything

that a missionary preacher does. I could not accept the idea that the texts and versions are roughly equal. I consider that an impossible position. A Greek text that is shorter by thousands of words is not the same as another that contains those words. A Greek text that removes or questions dozens of entire verses is not the same as one that contains those verses. I realized there was a solemn choice to be made, and I prayerfully set about to find the answer. In the course of my studies in those days, I was confronted with Peter Ruckman's writings.

My conclusion was expressed in a letter I wrote to Dr. Ruckman from Nepal on January 24, 1985. I told him that I had reached the conclusion that he had done more damage to the cause of the King James Bible than many of its detractors. I said: "...your writings--because of the spirit in which they are given--actually make me desire to flee from whatever beliefs you are propounding. I sincerely fear ... that you have done more damage to the cause of the truth of the preservation of the Textus Receptus and the faithful translations thereof than have the enemies of this position." I explained that I was a writer and that since I had reached such a conclusion I was determined to mention it at times in my writings and I wanted to let him know personally how I felt. I came to the conclusion that Dr. Ruckman was a hindrance to the cause of the King James Bible because his heretical doctrines (i.e., salvation is by works in the Old Testament and the Tribulation), his multiple divorces, his angry spirit, his Alexandrian cult mentality, his extremism regarding the KJV being advanced revelation, tend to cause men to reject the entire issue. Ruckman's teaching has also caused many unnecessary divisions and problems in churches. It is one thing if

a Christian tries to stand for the Word of God and leaves a church that does not so stand, a church that promotes the new versions, but it is quite another matter if a Christian becomes caught up in Ruckman's peculiar doctrines and spirit and comes to the conclusion that his church is apostate because it does not accept a Ruckman approach even though it is a King James only church.

James White ignores the fact that Ruckman and many of his followers treat men like me as enemies basically on the same level as those who are members of his Alexandrian Cult. Through the years, I have received literally thousands of letters and e-mail from those who were offended by my writings on various topics. I have written hundreds of articles and have published a dozen major books and 150 or more booklets, and in response I have heard from Mormons, Masons, Charismatics, Seventh-day Adventists, Promise Keepers, Modernists, Roman Catholics, New Evangelicals, infant baptizers, Tulip Calvinists, Southern Baptists, modern version defenders, Contemporary Christian Music lovers, and many others. Few were more discourteous, more obnoxious, more unreasonable than some (though not all) of those who have written to me to express their objection that I would say something negative about Peter Ruckman (or Gail Riplinger).

Ruckman has mocked me in articles in his magazine. In one brief article he called me a "conceited ass," a "lying rascal," "little hypocrite," "buttery, smook, slick, mush-mouthed sissy," "wimp," "puffed-up, conceited ass" (Peter Ruckman, *Bible Believer's Bulletin*, November 1994). To me, this demonstrates that

Ruckman's objective is not purely the defense of the King James Bible (which I defend without reservation) but the defense also of his own self. Of course, this tends to be the way of the flesh, of which we all partake. Dr. Ruckman is a brilliant but twisted man, and to lump the majority of King James Bible defenders into his camp is wrong, even slanderous. I believe Peter Ruckman is a saved man who knows and loves the Lord and who is genuinely zealous for God's Word, but something is strange and twisted about the man. Three wives have left him.

The reader would do well to ask himself why men like White persist in this approach. Why are they so powerfully motivated to force King James Bible defenders into the mold of someone like Dr. Ruckman? I believe the answer is simple. They do not want to deal with the real issues of the Bible text debate.

The same can be said of White's treatment of Gail Riplinger. He uses her and her book *New Age Bible Versions* as one of the chief examples of King James Bible defense, but he fails to inform his readers that many King James Bible defenders question Mrs. Riplinger's conspiratorial, conjecture-filled approach. Repeatedly White cites some erroneous or strange statement by Mrs. Riplinger, then makes a comment that such a statement exposes the error of the "KJV Only" position. Consider the following examples of this:

> "We note the irony of the strongly anti-Calvinistic bent of such KJV Only writers as Gail Riplinger in light of the fact that Rainolds, as a Puritan, was very much a Calvinist. The inconsistency of the KJV Only position is again seen with clarity" (White, p. 88).

> "Yet, she makes the following comment in regard to this, which I feel is *extremely* important for anyone wishing to understand the thinking of KJV Onlyism" (White, p. 108).

White attempts to make a direct connection between some of Mrs. Riplinger's possibly inconsistent and indefensible statements and the King James Bible defense in general. There is no doubt that Riplinger's book has been very popular, as any sensationalistic book like this usually is, but her book is only four years old and she is relatively a neophyte in the Bible version battle, as she herself would admit. Regardless of what one thinks of her work, it is silly to use her book as one of the two chief examples to describe the entire defense of the King James Bible. By the way, someone sympathetic to Mrs. Riplinger might be thinking here, "Yea, old Cloud probably thinks White should have used HIM as a key example of KJV defense." By no means do I believe any such thing. I am a nobody in the Bible version debate. I believe he should have used men like Dr. Edward F. Hills, Dr. Donald Waite, Dr. D.O. Fuller, Dr. Thomas Strouse, Jack Moorman, and a hundred other scholarly defenders of the TR-KJV. White does mention Hills and Waite, but he does not give serious attention to their important work. I am glad that I read the works of these men before I read White's book. Had I read White's book as a young Bible school student or as a young missionary, and had I taken him seriously, I would have had a very shallow, insufficient conception of the works of KJV defenders; and I might not have taken the time to read Hills, Waite, Fuller, and others.

James White does not explain that many KJV defenders have themselves exposed Riplinger's errors and extremism. I have a

large file folder with correspondence from King James Bible defenders who agree with me about the danger of Riplinger's book (as well as from many who bitterly disagree with me!). White does not explain for his readers that even many of those who find good in Mrs. Riplinger's book (I include myself in this category) do so with reservations. Why does he not give this information?

The Trinitarian Bible Society, for example, published a critical review of her work at least a year before White's book was published. Consider an excerpt:

> "She makes her statements without differentiating between the various translations, nor with differentiation between the reasons for the fallacies in these translations (e.g., text, translation principles, etc.). … In addition, the book contains many factual errors, false innuendoes, mistakes in logic, misquotations and instances of misleading research as well as general English language errors [in accompanying appendixes examples are given of each of these charges]. … It is therefore recommended that this book be read with the utmost discernment and that nothing be taken at face value. As far as is possible, the reader is encouraged to verify the truth of the information presented in this book before accepting and repeating the information to others. Because of the vast number of problems with this book, the Trinitarian Bible Society believe it is not trustworthy and therefore should not be used to defend the Authorised Version" (*A Review of New Age Bible Versions*, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, 1994).

The year before White's book appeared, I published a booklet entitled *New Age Bible Versions: A Critique*. I summarized my position as follows:

> "While I do not believe the connection between the modern versions and the New Age is as direct as Mrs. Riplinger contends, and I would discount many of the connections she tries to make, I have no doubt that there is a demonic involvement in the modern versions. I believe one can trace a clear line of demonic deception stretching from Tischendorf to Metzger. I do not see the modern versions DIRECTLY PROMOTING the New Age. Rather I believe the facts testify that the multiplicity of modern versions is AIDING the New Age by subtly weakening the authority the Word of God once held in the churches and in society. This having been said, I must hasten to add that I cannot recommend *New Age Bible Versions* by Mrs. Gail Riplinger. There are many good points made in the book, but it is so marred by error, carelessness, and faulty logic that it cannot be used as a dependable resource" (D.W. Cloud, *A Critique of New Age Bible Versions*, 1994).

Before printing this review I wrote to Mrs. Riplinger and asked her to reply to my concerns. She has never answered me personally. Instead, she dedicated a chapter of a subsequent book to mocking me after the fashion of Peter Ruckman. The chapter is called "O Madmen" in mockery of the title of my monthly magazine, *O Timothy*. Though younger than me and though she is unqualified to be a church leader or to teach or usurp authority over men, she calls me, an ordained Baptist preacher who has been in the ministry for 25 years, a "yearling who is still trying to figure out how to get the milk out of the bowl." Playing mockingly with my name, she says that clouds are full of hot air and are always changing their shape. The chapter is filled with such childish things. In my critique of this harsh piece of writing, I counted no less than seven outright slanders about me. Riplinger's book that includes her mocking review of me is entitled *Blind Guides*, and she has included me as one of

these guides. Why? Do I defend the King James Bible? I certainly do. Have I ever questioned anything in the King James Bible? Not a word. Do I support any modern version? Not one. Why, then, am I lumped into her "blind guides" category with men like James White? I cannot answer that with certainty, but it appears that because of her conspiratorial mindset, any questioning of her position is looked upon as a demonic attack and the person doing the questioning is looked upon as someone corrupted or influenced by the New Age. I only know that she viciously twisted my simple critique of her book and has demonstrated a very strange attitude. This is precisely the way Peter Ruckman has dealt with me and with many others who have questioned him.

James White knew exactly what he was doing when he selected Ruckman and Riplinger to be the chief spokesmen for the defense of the King James Bible. He is a clever man.

WHITE REPEATEDLY ATTACKS THE INTELLIGENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP OF KJV DEFENDERS.

Consider this statement in the opening pages of White's book: "The KJV Only controversy feeds upon the ignorance among Christians regarding the origin, transmission, and translation of the Bible. Those who have taken the time to study this area are not likely candidates for induction into the KJV Only camp" (White, Introduction, p. v).

This theme percolates through the book, and it is an approach

which is typical of those who defend the modern versions or who promote the position that the preserved Word of God is scattered throughout the texts and versions. Invariably they look down upon men who defend the Authorized Version or the Received Text. They ignore the scholarly credentials and diligent study of men like Edward Hills, Donald Waite, D.O. Fuller, Bruce Lackey, and Thomas Strouse. They ignore the diligent research behind the writings of many Authorized Version defenders. They ignore the vast libraries that many AV defenders have built in their effort to know the truth on this issue. They pretend that intelligent, learned people do not become defenders of the King James Bible.

Consider another example of this haughty approach from White's book: "KJV Only individuals are not generally interested in church history as a subject" (White, p. 10).

This is one of the strangest statements in this strange book. I don't know what people White has in mind, and I don't know what part of Mars he has been living on, but many of the King James Bible defenders with whom I fellowship are keenly interested in church history. Many of them, including me, have built extensive libraries in this area of research. I have rare books on the history of the Waldensians, the Baptists, the Roman Catholic Church, etc., which I have obtained at great expense, having paid as much as $1000 for one set of books and several hundred dollars each for other books and sets. I have diligently searched out volumes on the subject of the text and transmission of the Bible, and on visits to serious theological libraries, including the British Library, I have added to my

collection via copies of rare books on microfiche and photocopies of rare books which I have not been able to purchase outright. My personal library on the history of the English Bible and the transmission of the Scripture text is a very serious collection. White might reply, "You are an exception, Brother Cloud," but in my experience and knowledge of KJV defenders, I can say that he is wrong. I personally know hundreds of King James Bible defenders who love church history and have studied it diligently.

Though insidious, White's approach is effective. His constant implication that the defense of the King James Bible is predicated upon ignorance is intimidating, particularly to young preachers. What man wants to be a member of a society of ignoramuses! What man will spend the time and money to obtain and study books written by ignorant writers?

Consider one more example from White's book, illustrating his attitude toward those who defend the King James Bible: "It should be axiomatic among Christian scholars that open discussion and liberty should prevail. THAT IS ONE REASON WHY KJV ONLYISM HAS FOUND NO TRUE PROPONENT AMONGST CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS: it denies anyone the freedom to examine the KJV on the very same basis as any other translation. The position is, by its nature, anti-intellectual, anti-scholarship, and anti-freedom" (emphasis added) (White, p. 151).

Let me make the following comments on this amazing statement: *First, White sounds exactly like the theological Modernist here*. This is precisely how the haughty Modernist speaks about those who believe the Bible is the infallible Word of God. White's New

Evangelical training at a Southern Baptist university and at Fuller Seminary comes through loud and clear. The Modernist charges Bible believers with not granting "liberty" to those who hold opposing views. He charges them with being anti-intellectual, anti-scholarship, and anti-freedom. I am sorry, but the view that the Bible is the infallible Word of God cannot possibly allow freedom for "other views." If it is the infallible Word of God, it must be defended as such and no quarter can be given. Likewise, the view that God has preserved His Word in the Received Text and the King James Bible cannot possibly grant liberty for other views to be equal, because the other views promote Bibles which the King James Bible defender views as corrupt. A corrupt text can never be equal to a preserved one, and an impure translation can never be equal to an accurate one. It is fine for James White to be broadminded on this topic. His position allows him to do so, but that is impossible for the Received Text-King James Bible defender. It is not that the KJV defender is "anti-intellectual" or "anti-freedom." It is simply that his position does not allow it.

Second, White is lying here. He says there are NO proponents of "KJV Onlyism" among Christian scholars. We wonder how Mr. White defines a Christian scholar. Must one have a Ph.D. in textual criticism? If so, James White himself does not quality. The fact is that White has himself admitted that there are scholars who defend the King James Bible. He mentions some of these in his own book: Dr. Donald Waite (Th.D. with honors from Dallas and Ph.D. from Purdue), Dr. Edward F. Hills (Ph.D. from Harvard), and Dr. Peter Ruckman (Ph.D. from Bob Jones University). Though we don't agree with Dr. Ruckman on many

points, as has been noted already, there can be no doubt that he is a Christian scholar. He has an earned Ph.D., is at home in the biblical languages, and is a brilliant and widely read man on many subjects. I have already said I believe the man is twisted; but that does not mean he is not a genuine Christian scholar. Peter Ruckman is certainly as much a scholar as James White. Dr. Edward Hills was trained at the very highest scholarly level in textual criticism. Dr. Waite has better Greek and Hebrew credentials than James White and has decades more experience with the languages. When Dr. Waite began writing on the topic of Bible versions in 1971, James White was eight years old. While James was growing up and being educated at the feet of New Evangelical compromisers, Dr. Waite was conducting painstaking research projects, such as comparing, word-for-word, the Westcott-Hort Text with the Received Text, the NIV with the KJV, the original 1611 KJV with the modern KJV, the NKJV with the KJV, the NASV with the KJV, etc. James White does not come up to the level of any one of these men in scholarly credentials, yet he puffs himself up with the silly statement that no scholars are "King James only." It must be a joke, but we are not laughing.

If James White would argue here that Dr. Hills was not "King James Only," we would remind him that he himself uses Hills as an example of such in his own book.

Further, in chapter one of his book, White groups "KJV Only" into five broad categories. The second category includes those who "are joined by their common belief that the underlying Hebrew and Greek texts used by the King James translators are, for

various reasons, superior to all other original languages." White's third category of "KJV Only" is defined as those who are "Received Text only." Therefore, within White's five categories of "King James Onlyism" would fall every man that I have researched in our history *For Love of the Bible: The History of the Defense of the King James Bible*.

Allow me to give a partial list of Christian scholars who fit James White's own definition of "King James Only" -- Oswald Allis, Robert Barnett, David Blunt, Clinton Brainine, James Brookes, Terrance Brown, Mark Buch, John Burgon, E.L. Bynum, John Cereghin, Donald Clark, Frederic Cook, Bruce Cummons, Robert Lewis Dabney, William De Jonge, Russell Dennis, Nielson DiVietro, David Engelsma, Robert Flanigan, Everett Fowler, Paul Freeman, David Otis Fuller, Denis Gibson, William Grady, Jay P. Green, Sr., G.R. Guile, Herman Hanko, Robert Harbach, Samuel Hemphill, Lee Henise, Edward F. Hills, Zane Hodges, Herman Hoskier, William Hoste, Steven Houck, Kevin James, Don Jasmin, Ken Johnson, Jeffrey Khoo, Lebaron Kinney, Bruce Lackey, Gary LaMore, Theodore Letis, Alfred Levell, W. MacLean, D.K. Madden, Solomon Malan, Homer Massey, Philip Mauro, Michael Maynard, Alexander M'Caul, Alexander McClure, Edward Miller, Jack Moorman, Timothy Morton, Goebel Music, Frederick Nolan, Ian Paisley, Michael Penfold, J.C. Philpot, Jasper James Ray, Perry Rockwood, Chick Salliby, George Samson, Robert Sargent, John Wesley Sawyer, Stephen J. Scott-Pearson, Ron Smith, Skip Spencer, Russell Standish, Bob Steward, Thomas Strouse, Robert G. Taylor, J.P. Thackway, D.A. Thompson, John Henry Todd, Timothy Tow, Charles Turner, Peter Van Kleeck, Oscar Von Rohr, Donald Waite, Robert J.

Williams, B. Wordsworth, Ralph Yarnell, Gary Zeolla, and Samuel Zwemer. Details of these men's research can be found in our book *For Love of the Bible*.

All of these men fall into one of the five groups listed by James White as "King James Only" and all are men who have done scholarly research into the issue of Bible texts and versions. Some are linguists and textual scholars; others are not. Most of these men have advanced theological degrees. The others have demonstrated their scholarship by diligent, long-standing personal research. All of these men have published material on the subject of Bible texts and versions. In my estimation, each of these men has done research that is more significant than that done by James White. The *Webster's Deluxe Unabridged Dictionary* defines a scholar as "a learned person; one trained in a special branch of learning; an advanced student." I did not put myself in the previous list, but in all three of these dictionary senses, I am a scholar, though I do not have a Ph.D. in textual criticism. We believe in diligent study, but we also believe that many intelligent Christian men who lack advanced degrees from institutions of higher learning have nonetheless demonstrated their scholarship in biblical and related studies. **I believe God measures scholarship by a different standard than the world.** First of all, God's standard for scholarship requires that a man be born again, separated, and Spirit led and that he be a man with absolute faith in the Bible as the infallible Word of God.

Let me use the late Everett Fowler as an example. He spent many years diligently comparing the Received Text with the Westcott-Hort text, the Nestles Text, the Bible Societies Text,

and several popular modern English versions. He began this research in the 1950s, when he took courses in Greek and began reading the Nestles Greek text. He saw that this Greek text did not follow the King James Bible that was used in his church, the famous First Baptist Church of New York City, a center for biblical fundamentalism from its inception in 1711. Fowler served with the respected Fundamentalist leader Dr. Isaac M. Haldeman, who pastored the First Baptist Church from 1884 to 1933. Fowler served as a deacon in this church for 45 years, a Sunday School teacher for 40 years, trustee for 37 years, and treasurer for 21 years. In addition to his constant studies in the Greek New Testament, he read his English Bible through two times a year for 40 years. In 1976, Fowler obtained a copy of the Trinitarian Bible Society edition of the Received Text and he began the textual comparisons that resulted in the publication of the book *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament*. In my estimation, Everett Fowler was a Christian scholar and his book was a shining example of Christ-honoring Christian scholarship.

Even if James White disagrees with our definition of scholarship and would only allow us to list men who have advanced degrees from theological institutions, the entries in the above list would remain significant. I repeat, he has lied about the matter of scholarship on the side of the defense of the King James Bible.

WHITE IGNORES THE TEXTUAL TRADITION THAT PRECEDED THE ADOPTION OF THE RECEIVED TEXT IN THE 1500S.

White ignores the old Latin tradition, which had a wide influence separate from and alongside the Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate. He ignores the Waldensian Romaunt translations and other translations that followed a textual stream akin to the Received Text and distinct from the modern critical text. In his diligent research into the early history of the Bible in the first few centuries following the Apostles, and into the Waldensian Romaunt and the old Latin, Frederick Nolan (1784-1864) concluded that the critical variations from the Received Text which were being introduced in his day (and which are found in modern Bibles) were reflections of textual corruptions introduced by Origen and Eusebius of Cesarea and other heretical editors during the 2nd, 3rd and 4th centuries. Dr. Nolan concluded that the Received Text underlying the old Protestant Bibles (such as the English Authorized Version) is the text of the Apostles, and that the key omissions (such as those in Mark 16:9-20; Acts 20:28, 1 Timothy 3:16) found in the modern versions were introduced by heretics of the second and third centuries, or by those who were attempting to oppose the heretics. Nolan found evidence that the early Latin version called the Italick or old Latin was produced by Bible-believing Christians who were separate from Rome and its growing apostasy, and this biblical witness continued to be maintained in translations made by the Waldenses. The Waldensians, in the 16th century, raised the funds to publish the Olivetan French Received Text Bible, because they recognized that the text underlying it (the same text as that used by Luther for German and Tyndale for English) was the one they had used for centuries in the translations which were sought out and destroyed by the Roman Catholic authorities. We have documented this history in our book *Rome*

and the Bible: Tracing the History of the Roman Catholic Church and Its Persecution of the Bible and of Bible Believers and also in our book *For Love of the Bible* (Way of Life Literature, 1701 Harns Rd., Oak Harbor, WA 98277).

White leaves his readers in the dark about the true lineage of the Received Text, pretending that it was a happenstance thing created by a handful of men in the 16th century and adopted by God's people largely because of ignorance. This is a gross perversion of history. (We will say more about Erasmus and the Received Text further on.)

WHITE ASSUMES THAT BIBLE EDITORS AND TRANSLATORS ARE ALWAYS SINCERE AND DISCOUNTS THE FEAR THAT THE BIBLE HAS BEEN CORRUPTED.

From beginning to end of this book, White works from the faulty assumption that differences in the texts and versions are based largely on honest mistakes by sincere transcribers. Consider some examples of this:

> "And when textual variants appear in footnotes or in comparison with the KJV, believers can be assured that these things arose not because of some attempt to hide the truth from them, but due to the very understandable actions of scribes down through the centuries who were themselves doing their best to accurately copy those precious manuscripts" (White, pp. 186,87).
>
> "In either case, no malicious intention can be asserted one way or the other" (White, p. 178).

> "… there is no logical reason to impute evil motives to these translations" (White, p. 176).
>
> "Whenever one finds a number of different variants, one can be sure that the shorter reading (that of the modern texts) is the best, as it gave rise to all the others that are found in the manuscripts" (White, p. 185).

Of course, White cannot prove any of these statements. He does not know who these allegedly sincere scribes were. He cannot even give us their names, yet he pretends he knows the very motives of their hearts!

Note, too, that White accepts the assumption of modern textual criticism that the "shorter reading" is the most accurate, that the longer reading is usually a later scribal addition. They use this rule, not because they can prove that it is true, but because it conveniently supports the critical text and negates the longer Received Text. This "shorter reading" theory, and the assumption that textual changes were created by sincere men, are contrary to the testimony of Scripture. The Bible warns that the Devil hates the Word of God, that he has been attacking it ever since his conversation with Eve in the Garden of Eden. In the first century, even as the New Testament Scripture was being given, the Apostles were already hounded by false teachers who were corrupting the Word of God (2 Cor. 2:17). This attack increased tremendously during the next two centuries. The Lord Jesus and the Apostles warned repeatedly that false teachers would attempt to corrupt the truth (i.e., Matt. 7:15; 24:3-5,11,24; 2 Cor. 11:1-15; Gal. 1:6-9; Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 4:1-4; 2 Tim. 3:13; 2 Pet. 2:1-22; 1 John 2:18-26; 4:1; Jude 4). Church history bears out these

warnings.

In addition to copies of the apostolic books in the Greek language, within the first century after the Apostles (150 A.D.) there were also translations of the Greek New Testament into Latin and Syriac and possibly other languages. The Latin versions were very important because this language was spoken widely and was very influential. These versions multiplied and many corruptions were introduced. Heretics were busy adding to and taking away from the text, as it pleased them. Frederick Nolan (1784-1864), aforementioned researcher into early church history, observed that "the founders of those different sects had tampered with the text of Scripture … in some instances the genuine text had been wholly superseded by the spurious editions" (Nolan, *Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate*, 1815, pp. 468,69). The heretics also added extra canonical books to the text in spite of the seal which had been placed on the biblical canon (Revelation 22:18,19). These spurious books included Acts of Paul, Shepherd of Hermas, Revelation of Peter, Epistle of Barnabas, Teaching of the Twelve, Gospel of Peter, Gospel of Thomas, Gospel of Matthias, Acts of Andrew, Acts of John, etc. "The heretics of the 2nd century were so many, so brilliant, and so strong, that the fact that Christianity and the pure teaching of the New Testament survived is an impressive proof of their divine origin and authority" (Herbert Miller, *General Biblical Introduction*, Houghton, NY: The Word-Bearer Press, 1937, p. 141). Miller notes that these heretics rejected some the apostolic writings and mutilated others to suit their fancies and errors. "The convenience of labeling as ‘interpolations’ and casting out anything that did not square with their ideas of what

should be, so highly prized in our day, was popular at this time" (Miller, p. 141). Origen (185-254) produced editions of the Bible and writings that influenced later editors, including Eusebius of Cesarea and Jerome. Origen has been called "the Father of Biblical Criticism and Exposition." Though Origen sought to defend the Scriptures against certain heretics, he himself turned from the faith once delivered to the saints and introduced many heretical teachings to his followers and many textual corruptions into manuscripts--corruptions which were passed on by his successors and widely disseminated in the heretical atmosphere of that time and place.

Of Origen's textual efforts, Frederick Nolan makes the following important observation:

> "… *HE CONTRIBUTED TO WEAKEN THE AUTHORITY OF THE RECEIVED TEXT OF THE NEW [TESTAMENT*]. In the course of his Commentaries, he cited the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, on the former part of the Canon, he appealed to the authority of Valentinus and Heracleon on the latter. WHILE HE THUS RAISED THE CREDIT OF THOSE REVISALS, WHICH HAD BEEN MADE BY THE HERETICKS, HE DETRACTED FROM THE AUTHORITY OF THAT TEXT WHICH HAD BEEN RECEIVED BY THE ORTHODOX. Some difficulties which he found himself unable to solve in the Evangelists, he undertook to remove, *BY EXPRESSING HIS DOUBTS OF THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT.* In some instances he ventured to impeach the reading of the New Testament on the testimony of the Old, and to convict the copies of one Gospel on the evidence of another: *thus giving loose to his fancy, and indulging in many wild conjectures, HE CONSIDERABLY IMPAIRED THE CREDIT OF THE VULGAR OR COMMON EDITION, as well in the New as in the Old Testament*" (emphasis added) (Nolan, *Inquiry into the Integrity of*

the Greek Vulgate, pp. 432-34).

This testimony about Origen is important because subsequent textual editors, Eusebius and Jerome in particular, depended upon Origen's work. Nolan informs us that the heretical opinions of Origen had spread widely in Egypt. "Under the circumstances, the churches of Egypt were gradually prepared for the reception of a revised text, accommodated to the principles of Origen's criticism" (Nolan, p. 440). Please remember that Frederick Nolan was not a fundamental Baptist. He was writing in Britain in the late 18th and early 19th century. Few men have matched his research into the early transmission of the biblical text, yet he tells us that Origen was moving away from the pure text of Scripture which had come from the Apostolic hands, and successive editors continued in this direction. When we consider the spiritual condition of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, it is little wonder that they lacked the discernment necessary to recognize and transmit the pure Word of God. Their heretical doctrines warn us that they were controlled by the god of this world (1 Timothy 4:1-4). Again, we have documented this in our book *Rome and the Bible*.

Contrast these facts of history with the view White is promoting. Like the textual scholars he is following, many of whom hold the modernistic historical-critical view of the Old Testament and documentary views of the Gospels, White operates from an almost naturalistic view of the transmission of the biblical text. To the contrary, though, we know that the Devil has had an active role in attacking the Scriptures. Some might err in giving the Devil too much credit for textual and translational variants, but most textual scholars err in giving the Devil almost no credit. We

also know that many of the men involved in the transmission of the text were heretics. This was true not only in the second and third centuries, but throughout the centuries. The Roman Catholic Church represents a wide stream of apostasy from the faith once delivered to the saints, and its scribes and scholars were unregenerate men. The Roman Catholic Church was the politically dominant form of Christianity from the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries forwards. It tormented and persecuted Bible believing Christians. It often sought to destroy their Scriptures. It's monks transmitted manuscripts, but to assume that they were godly, spiritually sincere men is nonsense. We have carefully documented these historical facts in our book *Rome and the Bible: Tracing the History of the Roman Catholic Church and Its Persecution of the Bible and of Bible Believers*.

Click here for Part 2 of this critique.